

Appl. No. 10/073,431
Amdt. Date: September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed March 15, 2005 in the above-captioned application.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112:

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter and claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-5 have been amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention and claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC. §101 and §112 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chasen et al (6,760,721. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 7 has been cancelled. It is believed that the remaining claims, as amended, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

An anticipating reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Chasen et al., however fails to teach, show or suggest selecting a descendant member, editing a decision attribute of the selected descendant member and automatically applying the edited decision attribute to direct descendants of the selected descendant member. It is therefore believed that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is not proper and it is respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.


Appl. No. 10/073,431
Amdt. Date: September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasen et al. in view of Microsoft Office 97. For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that Chasen et al. fails to teach, show or suggest the Applicant's invention as claimed in amended claim 1, the sole independent claim in the application, which claim is believed to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, claim 5 which depends from claim 1 is also in condition for allowance.

The citation of the prior art made of record and not relied upon is noted. However, it is believed that the prior art not relied upon is no more pertinent than the applied references, and therefore a detailed discussion of the prior art not relied upon is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to the outstanding office action.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick A. Nichols, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,573

Nick A. Nichols, Jr., P.C.
P. O. Box 16399
Sugar Land, TX 77496-6399
281-494-8331